United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/27/PHL/2

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 February 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-seventh session
1-12 May 2017

Compilation on the Philippines

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a compilation of the information contained in the reports of treaty bodies and special procedures and other relevant United Nations documents, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[1,2]

2. The United Nations country team stated that, in accordance with a recommendation that had enjoyed the support of the Philippines, the State had acceded to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.[3] In 2015, the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment highlighted the importance of enacting a law to establish an effective national preventive mechanism.[4]

3. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) recommended accession to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.[5]

4. In 2016, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended ratifying the International Labour Organization (ILO) Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169). In 2016, that same Committee, together with the Committee against Torture, and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, encouraged the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.[6]

GE.17-03244(E)

Please recycle

5. In 2014, the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families invited the Philippines to accede to the ILO Minimum Wage Fixing Convention, 1970 (No. 131), the ILO Safety and Health in Construction Convention, 1988 (No. 167), and the ILO Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181).[7]

6. In 2013, the Committee on the Rights of the Child recommended that the Philippines ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.[8]

7. In 2016, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions called on the Philippines to lift a series of preconditions it had imposed on her planned visit to investigate the alleged extrajudicial killings of suspected drug dealers since President Rodrigo Duterte had taken office.[9]

8. In 2015, the Philippines made a financial contribution to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).[10]

III. National human rights framework[11]

9. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern that, in the case of an irreconcilable conflict between treaty norms and national laws, the jurisprudence of the Supreme Court recognized the supremacy of national law. The Committee recommended that the Philippines clarify the status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in its domestic legal order and ensure the precedence of its provisions over national laws in cases of conflict.[12]

10. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights urged the Philippines to expedite the adoption of the Commission on Human Rights Charter (Senate bill No. 2818).[13] The Committee against Torture recommended providing the Commission with full functional, structural and financial support.[14] In 2012, the Human Rights Committee recommended ensuring that the Commission enjoyed full fiscal autonomy.[15]

11. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended enhancing transparency, accountability and participation in the conduct of public affairs through the full implementation of the Good Governance and Anti-Corruption Plan for 2012-2016 and beyond.[16]

12. Referring to the relevant supported recommendations,[17] the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) stated that police officers assigned to the Women and Children Protection Centre within the police had received human rights training. Multidisciplinary training was also given to front-line service providers, including police officers, on the Case Management Protocol for Child Victims of Abuse, Exploitation and Neglect. UNICEF stated that all police officers should receive training on the handling of children as victims, witnesses and offenders.[18]

IV. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

A. Cross-cutting issues

1. Equality and non-discrimination[17]

13. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights expressed concern at the delay in adopting a comprehensive anti-discrimination law, as proposed in Senate bill No. 2475. It was also concerned at the discriminatory provisions in the existing laws, including section 29 (a) of the Immigration Act and sections 269 and 272 (b) of the Labour Code, as well as at the discriminatory application of laws, such as article 200 of the Revised Penal Code, against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.[20]

14. The Human Rights Committee expressed concern at the prevalence of stereotypes and prejudices against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in the military, the police and society at large, and recommended adopting a comprehensive anti-discrimination law that prohibited discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.[21]

15. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted with concern that discriminatory gender stereotypes, the lack of an adequate support system and stigma posed barriers to access to justice and effective remedies for women.[22] It recommended strengthening efforts to ensure the full and timely implementation of the Women's Priority Legislative Agenda,[23] and fully enforcing the Magna Carta of Women.[24]

16. UNICEF expressed concern about gender-based discrimination against men and boy victims of rape because of the lower penalties handed down to their rapists when compared to similar crimes involving victims who were women and girls.[25]

2. Development, the environment, and business and human rights[26]

17. The Special Rapporteur on the right to food stated that the impressive growth in the Philippines had not benefited all. Poverty remained high and was becoming entrenched as the income gap widened. The unsustainable export-oriented agro-industry, as well as large land acquisition projects for cash crops, should be avoided in order to protect smallholder farmers and to maintain self-sufficiency.[27]

18. The Special Rapporteur also stated that the Philippines was vulnerable to climate change. As a result, food and nutritional insecurity was likely to increase over the coming decades through a combination of more extreme weather events, rising sea levels and shifting rainfall patterns. Climate-related losses continued to be very high for the agricultural sector.[28] The marine ecosystem was also affected by the climate crisis.[29]

19. The United Nations country team stated that the Philippines had signed but had yet to ratify the Paris Agreement. Progress had been made on the 2011-2028 National Climate Change Action Plan, but challenges to its implementation remained.[30]

3. Human rights and counter-terrorism

20. The Human Rights Committee recommended reviewing the Human Security Act of 2007 to ensure that it not only defined crimes of terrorism in terms of their purpose, but also defined the nature of those acts with sufficient precision to enable individuals to regulate their conduct accordingly.[31]

B. Civil and political rights

1. Right to life, liberty and security of person[32]

21. The United Nations country team, referring to relevant supported recommendations, stated that the Government's anti-drug campaign had led to alleged "drug users and pushers" being killed. It added that there was an urgent need to stop all extrajudicial killings and any incitement to commit such killings. Also, the Government's methods of combating the use of illegal drugs must be brought into line with international standards.[33]

22. The Human Rights Committee expressed concern at the continued perpetration of extrajudicial killings and enforced disappearances. It was particularly concerned at the proliferation of private armies and vigilante groups that were partly responsible for those crimes, as well as at the large number of illegal firearms. The Committee was concerned at the arming and use of "force multipliers" for counter-insurgency and other purposes.[34]

23. The Committee against Torture expressed concern that obstacles continued to exist for the effective implementation of the Anti-Torture Act and that impunity for acts of torture continued to prevail.[35] It was also concerned at the lack of implementation of sections 18 and 19 of the Act, which provided for compensation and the formulation of a rehabilitation programme for victims of torture.[36]

24. The Committee against Torture expressed concern at reports of the existence of secret places of detention where persons had routinely been subjected to torture, and recommended the immediate closure of all such places.[37]

25. The same Committee was particularly concerned at the persistence of critical and chronic overcrowding in all detention facilities.[38] Moreover, the incidence of infectious diseases such as tuberculosis was extremely high.[39] The Committee was also concerned that child offenders were kept in regular prisons and were not separated from adult detainees,[40] about sexual violence against detainees and about the treatment of detainees belonging to minorities.[41]

26. Referring to the relevant supported recommendation,[42] the United Nations country team stated that the extreme overcrowding of prisons had worsened, the training of prison guards was substandard and that the provision of food, water, sanitation and treatment for health conditions, including communicable diseases such as HIV and tuberculosis, was grossly inadequate.[43]

2. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[44]

27. The Committee against Torture expressed concern at the huge backlog of cases in the judiciary and at the preponderant role of the Department of the Interior and its impact on the independence of the judiciary. The Committee recommended strengthening the independence of the judiciary and the capacity of the judicial system.[45]

28. The Committee on the Rights of the Child urged the Philippines to strengthen the presence and capacity of family courts in all provincial areas.[46]

29. The Committee against Torture expressed alarm at reports that the overwhelming majority of reported cases of torture took place in police stations, in order to extract confessions or information to be used in criminal proceedings.[47] It recommended reviewing all cases where convictions had been based solely on confessions, ensuring that persons convicted on the basis of evidence gained through coercion or as a result of torture and ill-treatment were afforded a new trial and adequate redress, and also ensuring that law enforcement officials, army personnel, judges, prosecutors and lawyers received training on detecting and investigating cases in which confessions were obtained under torture.[48]

30. The same Committee expressed concern that victims and witnesses of torture had been reluctant to report cases for fear of harassment, reprisals and lack of protection.[49] It recommended strengthening the witness protection programme.[50]

31. The Committee expressed concern that arrests had been made by the police, military personnel and ordinary citizens without warrants and that those arrested included children.[51]

32. The Committee was concerned at the excessive length of pretrial detention. It recommended urgently releasing persons whose pretrial detention exceeded the maximum penalty for their alleged offences, reviewing the legality of the pretrial detention of all detainees, amending legislation to shorten the duration of pretrial detention and expediting the cases of persons held under the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act.[52]

33. The Committee expressed concern that detained persons did not enjoy fundamental legal safeguards from the very outset of their deprivation of liberty. It recommended guaranteeing all detained persons prompt access to a lawyer immediately upon being deprived of their liberty and, if necessary, to legal aid, including during the initial interrogation, as well as immediate access to an independent medical examination, free of charge and not in the presence of police officers, and that they should be brought before a judge within the time frame prescribed by law.[53]

34. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, UNICEF stated that the passage of the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act of 2006 (Republic Act No. 10630) had strengthened the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act.[54]

35. The Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern at initiatives to lower the age of criminal responsibility of children.[55] The Committee against Torture was concerned at the tabling of bill No. 922 in Congress lowering the age of criminal responsibility from 15 to 9 years and recommended immediate withdrawal of the bill.[56]

36. In 2016, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights urged the Philippine judicial authorities to launch investigative processes following an admission by the President of the Philippines that, as Mayor of Davao, he had killed people and encouraged others to do the same.[57]

37. The Committee on the Rights of the Child was specifically concerned that impunity remained pervasive in the context of child pornography and trafficking-related investigations and prosecutions mainly due to the complicity of law enforcement, judicial and immigration officials in human trafficking and corruption.[58]

38. The United Nations country team referred to a relevant supported recommendation and stated that the Philippines had made good efforts to increase gender sensitivity in the courts. However, women with disabilities and from marginalized groups experienced discrimination in the formal and informal justice systems.[59]

3. Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[60]

39. The Human Rights Committee expressed regret that the Cybercrime Prevention Act of 2012 had criminalized libel over the Internet. It urged the State party to consider the decriminalization of defamation.[61]

40. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights expressed concern at the continuing cases of harassment, disappearance, threats and killings of human rights defenders.[62] The United Nations country team referred to a relevant supported recommendation[63] and stated that, following the May 2016 elections, harassment and attacks against media personnel and citizen commentators had spiked and a top official had publically stated that corrupt journalists would not be exempt from assassination.[64] The

Human Rights Committee expressed concern at reports that human rights defenders and political dissidents were often subjected to surveillance by law enforcement personnel.[65]

41. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women remained concerned about the underrepresentation of women from vulnerable groups, such as indigenous and Muslim women, in all areas of political and public life.[66]

4. Prohibition of all forms of slavery[67]

42. The Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, stated that, within the Philippines, trafficking in Filipino men, women and children for labour exploitation had proliferated in various sectors, including the agricultural, construction, fishing, manufacturing and services industries.[68] The high demand for female domestic workers from the Philippines and the large number of Filipinos seeking overseas employment had made trafficking for domestic servitude one of the most prevalent forms of cross-border trafficking.[69] Many Filipinos, including children, were being trafficked abroad for their organs.[70] Trafficking in women and children for sexual exploitation, mainly to other countries in Asia and to the Middle East but also within the Philippines, was widespread.[71] The exploitation of children, especially girls, for sex tourism was alarmingly common and sometimes socially and culturally tolerated in many areas of the country.[72]

43. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women recommended the development of a legal framework to explicitly address contemporary methods of trafficking that made use of information and communications technologies such as online matchmaking.[73]

44. UNICEF referred to a relevant supported recommendation and stated that the Philippines was implementing the Recovery and Reintegration Programme for Trafficked Persons, which ensured adequate recovery services for trafficked persons.[74]

45. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that a large number of women were being subjected to exploitation through prostitution and that women in prostitution had been criminalized under the Revised Criminal Code.[75]

46. The Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern that there was insufficient engagement with and regulation of the private sector to prevent and combat child sex tourism.[76] The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned at the increasing incidence of online sexual exploitation and abuse of children.[77] In that regard, the United Nations country team referred to relevant supported recommendations and stated that the Philippines had been drafting a strategic national response plan to prevent online child sexual exploitation for the period 2016-2020.[78]

5. Right to privacy and family life

47. The Committee on the Rights of the Child noted with concern that protection of the privacy and safety of child victims was not systematically ensured in the media and the criminal justice process and that, despite existing prohibitions, the sexualization of children, especially in television shows, was common.[79]

48. The same Committee remained concerned that the sale of children for the purpose of illegal adoption and that the tampering of the civil registry by individuals to make it appear that a child was their biological offspring (so-called "birth simulation") were still prevalent in the Philippines.[80]

C. Economic, social and cultural rights[81]

1. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[82]

49. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights expressed concern that the contracting out of workers for periods of five months, a practice called "contract ualization" that was legitimized by the 1989 "Herrera Law" (Act No. 6715), was rampant across all economic sectors, increasing the number of workers under short-term contracts and with lower levels of protection.[83]

50. The United Nations country team stated that the Contract of Service under the Nurse Deployment Project of the Department of Health provided for the termination of a female nurse's employment contract if she became pregnant, which was in conflict with the Labour Code of the Philippines.[84]

51. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights noted that the Wage Rationalization Act of 1989 had abolished the national minimum wage, and recommended reviewing the Act with a view to reinstating the national minimum wage.[85]

52. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women remained concerned at persistent occupational gender segregation, with women concentrated in social and caregiving work, as well as the wide gender wage gap and the restrictive interpretation of the principle of equal pay fo. work of equal value.[86] The Committee was also concerned about the overrepresentation of women in the informal sector,[87] about the fact that the sexual harassment of women in the workplace was widespread and about the prevalence of impunity in that regard.[88]

2. Right to social security[89]

53. UNICEF stated that the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction had an updated registry containing 15 million households, including 5.1 million households assessed as poor using an enhanced proxy means test. Unless issues on data privacy were resolved pursuant to the 2012 Data Privacy Act, the use of the System to reach the poor would be limited. The Conditional Cash Transfer Programme had been expanded and a modified conditional cash transfer programme had been implemented to cater for the poor and vulnerable populations not covered by the original programme.[90]

54. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights expressed concern that public spending on social protection remained low. It also expressed concern that the Social Pension for Indigent Senior Citizens covered only 28.5 per cent of the statutory pension age population and that the amount of the benefit was insufficient to ensure an adequate standard of living for beneficiaries and their families.[91]

3. Right to an adequate standard of living[92]

55. In 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food stated that access to sufficient and nutritious food was limited by poverty and income levels.[93] A relatively higher incidence of poverty was evident in certain regions of the country where conflict and insurgencies had contributed to social instability.[94]

56. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights expressed concern at the high incidence of absolute poverty among small-scale fisherfolk and landless farmers. It was particularly concerned that the livelihood of small-scale fisherfolk had been under threat owing to declining fish stocks and the encroachment of commercial fishing vessels on fishing zones. The Committee welcomed the amendments to the Fisheries Code of 1998 under Act No. 10654 of 2015, which should bring about improvements in that regard.[95]

57. The Special Rapporteur on the right to food noted severe gaps in the implementation of policies and strategies to realize the right to adequate food, [96] and recommended adopting a national right-to-food framework law based on time-bound benchmarks and effective implementation plans for each region[97] and passing the Right to Adequate Food Bill, the National Land Use and Management Act, the Agrarian Reform Extension Law and all other pending bills relating to the right to adequate food and nutrition.[98]

58. The Special Rapporteur stated that there had been an increase in the land converted from agricultural to urban use, which had had a significant impact on smallholder farmers. In many cases, land conversion might result in the loss of prime agricultural land, a reduction in agricultural jobs and wasted investment in irrigation infrastructure.[99]

59. The Special Rapporteur noted that the Government had declared a policy of national self-sufficiency in food staples through the Food Staples Sufficiency Programme and that while in principle the policy of encouraging rice self-sufficiency was commendable, in reality the country did not provide enough food to meet all of its caloric needs.[100]

60. According to the Special Rapporteur, the issue of land reform remained extremely controversial, with huge tracts of land remaining in the possession of a few while farmers and farmworkers who had tilled and worked the land were unable to reap the benefits of their harvests or to ensure an adequate supply of food for their families.[101]

61. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned that land-grabbing continued and that the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program Extension with Reforms had been phased out, despite having been only partly implemented, leaving many farmers landless.[102]

62. The Committee was also concerned that public funding allocated to social housing remained low and that the provision of social housing remained insufficient. A large proportion of the population lived in informal settlements in poor living conditions, had limited access to basic services and infrastructure, health care and education and was under the constant threat of eviction.[103]

63. The Committee was further concerned that the Urban Development and Housing Act legalized forced evictions and demolitions, and at the inadequate measures taken to provide appropriate relocation sites or adequate compensation to families who had been forcibly evicted.[104]

4. Right to health[105]

64. Referring to the relevant supported recommendations, UNICEF noted that the Philippines had adopted the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act, which guaranteed universal access to maternal health, family planning and sex education.[106] The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern that women's access to sexual and reproductive health services was still severely restricted; that the numbers of early pregnancies, unsafe abortions and HIV infections were increasing, particularly among adolescent girls; and that the revocation of Manila City Executive Orders Nos. 003 and 030 had been implied by the adoption of the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act but had not been expressly declared, resulting in confusion among health professionals and a persistent lack of access to services and information about sexual and reproductive health and rights for women and girls in Manila City.[107] The Committee was concerned that Sorsogon City had adopted Executive Order No. 3 in February 2015, which had resulted in the withdrawal of modern contraceptives from city and community health facilities.[108]

65. Referring to the supported recommendations on the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals,[109] the United Nations country team stated that, given the significant

increases in new HIV cases, the Philippines had failed to meet the target to halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS (Goal 6).[110] UNICEF too referred to the relevant supported recommendations and stated that, of the health-related Goals, only the one on reducing the mortality of children under 5 years of age had been met. There had been hardly any change in the maternal mortality rate over the previous three decades.[111]

66. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women called for an amendment to articles 256 to 259 of the Criminal Code to legalize abortion in cases of rape, incest, threat to the life and/or health of the mother or serious malformation of the fetus and to decriminalize all other cases in which women underwent abortion.[112]

5. Right to education[113]

67. UNICEF referred to the relevant supported recommendations and stated that the Philippines had passed legislation making enrolment in kindergarten and two more years of attendance in senior high school mandatory, to raise the quality of education. Efforts had been made to identify and ensure that all 3- and 4-year-olds attended preschool and that all 5- to 11-year-olds attended elementary school. Access to education for the most disadvantaged learners had been enhanced through the Alternative Learning System Programme.[114]

68. UNESCO encouraged the Philippines to ensure compulsory and free education, to invest more in education, to take further measures to ensure that school-age children completed their education and to ensure adult literacy.[115]

69. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned at the lower number of girls enrolled in pre-primary and primary education compared to boys and at gender segregation in higher education.[116]

D. Rights of specific persons or groups

1. Women[117]

70. Referring to the relevant supported recommendations, the United Nations country team stated that Muslim women, indigenous women, women with disabilities, women who were migrant workers, internally displaced women and lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex women faced a heightened risk of violence, exploitation and abuse, as well as discrimination in political and public life, marriage and family relations, employment, education, access to justice and health care.[118]

71. The United Nations country team referred to the relevant supported recommendations and stated that there had been limited progress in ensuring that legislation conformed to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and other human rights instruments.[119]

72. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted that the harmonization of national legislation with the Magna Carta of Women remained pending, including amendments to the Family Code, the Penal Code, the Anti-Rape Law, the Anti-Sexual Harassment Act and the Code of Muslim Personal Laws.[120]

73. The same Committee noted with concern the delay in the adoption of a bill to repeal a provision of the Family Code recognizing the supremacy of a husband's decision over that of his wife in respect of community property, the exercise of parental authority and guardianship over a child.[121]

74. The same Committee expressed concern about the intensification of gender-based violence against women, including by members of the armed forces, in conflict-affected areas and in areas of large-scale development projects.[122]

75. The same Committee was concerned at the limited scope of the Anti-Violence against Women Act, which focused mainly on domestic violence by intimate partners.[123]

76. The same Committee recommended expediting the amendment of the Anti-Rape Law incorporating lack of consent as a primary element in the definition of rape and raising the minimum age of sexual consent, which was set too low, at 12 years, to at least 16 years.[124]

77. The same Committee also recommended encouraging the media to portray positive images of women and the equal status of women and men, as well as to avoid gender stereotypes in media coverage of gender-based violence against women.[125]

78. The Human Rights Committee was concerned at the lack of legislation providing for the dissolution of marriages, which might have the effect of compelling victims of sexual and gender-based violence to remain in violent relationships.[126]

79. The same Committee recommended that the Philippines revise the Code of Muslim Personal Laws to prohibit polygamous marriages and repeal the provisions discriminating on the basis of religion regarding the minimum age of marriage for girls.[127]

80. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed concern that the appropriation of land and the resulting displacement owing to the activities of the extractive industries, development projects and disasters continued to affect rural women disproportionately.[128] Women living in rural areas were being forcibly evicted and relocated as a result of large development projects and the activities of the extractive industries.[129]

2. Children[130]

81. Referring to the relevant supported recommendations, UNICEF stated that the Philippines had adopted the Children's Emergency Protection and Relief Act, which mandated the establishment of evacuation centres and child-friendly spaces, the restoration of civil registry documents to facilitate the reunification of separated children and the training of emergency responders in child protection.[131]

82. The Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict expressed concern about the killing and maiming of children during military operations by the armed forces, and urged the Government to prioritize the passage of the draft law on children in situations of armed conflict.[132] Referring to a relevant supported recommendation, UNICEF stated that a strategic plan by the armed forces identifying concrete steps to protect children affected by armed conflict and in the course of military operations had not yet been signed.[133]

83. The Committee against Torture was concerned that the corporal punishment of children in the home remained lawful and recommended the adoption of the Anti-Corporal Punishment Bill (No. 2182).[134] Referring to relevant supported recommendations, UNICEF stated that none of the bills prohibiting corporal punishment and promoting positive discipline had been passed into law.[135]

84. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights reiterated its concerns that an estimated 1.5 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 years were engaged in child labour and that half of them were working in hazardous or dangerous conditions and were exposed to various forms of sexual and economic exploitation.[136]

52. Salinlahi stated that the Government had failed to implement the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act by not providing rehabilitation to youth offenders by a multi-disciplinary team.[83]

53. JS2 stated that impunity for severe human rights violations had continued even though at the 2012 Review, the Philippines had supported several recommendations to address that issue.[84] HRW also referred to those recommendations and stated that widespread impunity had continued for members of the security forces allegedly responsible for serious human rights violations.[85]

54. IFI-RPRD stated that the already entrenched culture of impunity had been reinforced by sloppy investigations into alleged abuses committed during police operations and the apparent tolerance of vigilante groups in the war on illegal drugs.[86]

55. NUPL referred to the supported recommendation to inter alia bring to justice perpetrators of human rights violations, including Major General Jovito Palparan Jr. and Joel Reyes,[87] and stated that the Government had openly shown its acquiescence to the alleged actions of Palparan and had flaunted its refusal to comply with its commitments made during the 2012 Review.[88]

56. AI stated that although the Witness Protection, Security and Benefit Act provided for extensive protection, its implementation had been weak, and had not meet the urgent requirements of witnesses.[89]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[90]

57. ADF stated that despite constitutional protection, the persecution of by "Islamic extremists" had continued.[91]

58. JC stated that there had been concerns over the proposed Bangsamoro Basic Law, which would expand sharia jurisdiction to cover civil, commercial, and criminal law, in addition to the family law. Although sharia law only applied to Muslims, the Christian community within the autonomous region was concerned that its members could be forced to adhere to Sharia law.[92]

59. UCCP stated that the UCCP Northeast Southern Tagalog Conference had reported persistent surveillance,[93] and cited specific cases of surveillance and intimidation.[94]

60. JS11 stated that the definition of cybersex in the Cybercrime Prevention Act is "overly broad and vague" and empowered law enforcement personnel to use their own standards of morality.[95]

61. JS5 stated that the revised Penal Code (articles 353-355), which criminalizes libel and slander and the 2012 Cybercrime Prevention Act which criminalises online libel, had been repeatedly used to stifle freedom of expression and to harass independent journalists.[96]

62. NCCP stated that the rhetoric especially by President Durterte, which painted the press as unpatriotic and against the national interest, made journalists vulnerable to human rights violations.[97]

63. JS14 stated that despite the acceptance of two recommendations relating to the protection of journalists and human rights defenders,[98] extrajudicial killing remained the gravest threat facing human rights defenders.[99] JS2 stated that since the 2012 Review, at least 147 human rights defenders and 23 journalists had been killed.[100] FLD stated that there were real fears that targeted attacks against human rights defenders will increase under the current administration.[101]

64. FLD stated that fabricated charge of libel had been repeatedly used against human rights defenders, particularly since the amendment of the relevant law which shifted the burden of proof on the accused.[102] JS2 stated that some human rights defenders had faced "trumped-up" charges based on falsified evidence.[103] Karapatan stated that leaders of

85. The Committee against Torture remained concerned at the situation of children who were being subjected to abduction and military recruitment by armed groups.[137]

3. Persons with disabilities[138]

86. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recommended reviewing the Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities (Act No. 7277) and other laws on disability, expanding the provision of reasonable accommodation and providing personal assistance services. The Committee also recommended allocating sufficient funding for disability-related programmes and services.[139]

87. UNICEF referred to a supported recommendation and stated that the Philippines would be launching a new social health insurance benefit package for children with disabilities that would cover rehabilitation services.[140]

88. The Special Rapporteur on the right to food expressed concern about the fact that insufficient measures had been taken to ensure that persons with disabilities had equal access to all public facilities and services.[141]

89. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights remained concerned about the fact that persons with disabilities experienced particular difficulties in gaining access to social housing.[142]

4. Minorities and indigenous peoples[143]

90. The Special Rapporteur on the right to food noted that ancestral land was being lost as a result of displacement caused by development projects and the activities of the extractive industries, as well as by environmental degradation. He also noted that such loss had undermined the capacity of indigenous peoples to survive, since they were very dependent on their land and resources.[144] She stressed the importance of gaining the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples to any change to their lands and territories.[145] The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned at the conflicts between the protection of indigenous peoples' ancestral lands under sections 5 and 56 of the 1997 Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act and the provisions of the 1995 Mining Act and the 1974 Forestry Reform Code of the Philippines, as well as the delay in adopting the National Land Use Bill. The Committee recommended full implementation of the 1997 Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act.[146]

91. In 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons stated that the indigenous peoples of Mindanao, known as Lumads, had been disproportionately affected by the long-standing conflict between the Government and the New People's Army.[147]

5. Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[148]

92. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned at the widespread exploitation and abuse of Filipino women migrant workers working abroad, in particular domestic workers, and the insufficient support provided to reintegrate returning women migrant workers.[149]

93. The Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families recommended that the Philippines enhance the assistance provided through embassies and consulates to migrant workers who were victims of the *kafalah* (sponsorship) system.[150] It also recommended that the Philippines consider raising that issue with a view to having the Governments concerned abolish that system.[151]

people's organizations in Negros, Cagayan Valley, Davao City, and Sarangani had been falsely charged with criminal offenses such as kidnapping and trafficking.[104]

65. JS5 stated that progressive legislation proposed in 2013 – the Human Rights Defenders Bill or House Bill 1472, was yet to be adopted.[105]

66. JS5 stated that the registration process to form associations remained unduly onerous and subjected to overly strict bureaucratic controls.[106]

67. JS5 stated that there have been several reported cases of excessive use of force by law enforcement agencies when dispersing peaceful assemblies.[107]

68. TCC stated that violence was prevalent during the election period and on election-day;[108] and that "vote-buying" was widespread.[109] Practical barriers[110] restricted Indigenous Peoples from registering to vote and from voting.[111]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[112]

69. JS6 stated that the facilities and services to address the needs of victims of human trafficking remained inadequate.[113] It made recommendations including that the Philippines implement the commitments it had made at the 2012 Review,[114] and increase the budget for the shelters.[115]

70. CMA called for criminal justice reforms to ensure expeditious investigations and trials for alleged perpetrators of human trafficking,[116] and for a broadened public information campaign on the rehabilitation programme for women victims.[117]

71. JS21 stated there remained a lack of political will to fully implement the Anti-Trafficking in Person Act, which had also been hindered by corruption.[118]

72. JS11 stated that the use of children in cybersex had continued unabated despite the passage of the Anti-Child Pornography Act in 2009, the conducting of police raids and the arrests of alleged perpetrators.[119]

Right to privacy and family life

73. JS22 stated that interception of communication through wiretapping is permitted when authorised by a court order. The Grievance Committee as envisaged by the Human Security Act with a mandate to investigate complaints had not been established. Also, reports by the Joint Oversight Committee, which had the power to question law enforcement authorities on the interception of communication, had not been published.[120]

74. JS22 stated that in the 2014 case of *Disini v. The Secretary of Justice* the court had ruled that Section 12 of the Cybercrime Prevention Act had threatened the constitutional rights to privacy and struck-down the provision. However the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the law, which had been promulgated in August 2015, had effectively reinstated the struck down provision.[121]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights[122]

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[123]

75. DJP stated that the Herrera Law (RA 6715) made provision for workers to be hired by man-power agencies or third parties who were then sent to companies requiring their labour. The workers were not considered as employees of those companies and were poorly paid, received no benefits and had no union rights.[124]

76. COURAGE stated that the majority of the 1.3 million government employees had received a salary less than the Constitutionally-mandated "family living wage".[125]

94. The same Committee expressed concern that sections 269 and 272 (b) of the Labour Code had impeded the exercise by migrant workers in the Philippines of the right to form or join a trade union.[152]

95. The same Committee recommended that the Government ensure that the right of a migrant worker to reside in the Philippines for the purpose of employment not be revoked if the migrant worker lost employment prematurely.[153]

96. UNHCR noted that refugees and stateless persons who had completed their education in the Philippines were not allowed to take a licensure examination under the current legal framework and were therefore unable to practise their profession.[154]

97. In 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons recalled that Typhoon Haiyan, which had made landfall on 8 November 2013, had caused the internal displacement of over 4 million people.[155] She added that the attention and resources required to achieve durable solutions for those persons were waning.[156] The Government must assess the immediate needs of all internally displaced persons in bunkhouses or transitional shelters and must improve and guarantee the services provided to them.[157] Restoration of permanent housing and livelihood of all affected persons must be completed as quickly as possible.[158]

98. The Special Rapporteur noted that people in Mindanao, Zamboanga and Maguindanao had been displaced by the long-standing internal armed conflict,[159] and stated that it was essential that the Government and its local counterparts ensure all necessary assistance and support to persons displaced within the country by conflict.[160]

6. Stateless persons[161]

99. UNHCR stated that birth registration was fundamental to prevent statelessness.[162] Referring to the recommendation to ensure the free and effective birth registration of all children, UNHCR stated that in 2015 a national action plan to end statelessness had been developed by the Government.[163] The plan recognized that no child was born stateless and identified the need to resolve existing situations of statelessness and to ensure birth registration for the prevention of statelessness, among other issues.[164] In 2012, the Regional Legislative Assembly of the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao passed the Muslim Mindanao Autonomy Act No. 293, which provided, among other things, for the late registration of births, free of charge.[165]

100. The Committee on the Rights of the Child was concerned that there was a high number of children who had not been registered, especially in Mindanao.[166]

101. The Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families was concerned at the reported difficulties in registering the births of Filipino migrant children abroad, including those in an irregular situation.[167]

102. The United Nations country team recommended that the Philippines accede to the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.[168]

E. Specific regions or territories

103. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted that the Philippines had signed the Comprehensive Agreement on the Bangsamoro, a temporary peace agreement with the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, to put an end to a long-lasting armed conflict.[169]

Notes

[1] Tables containing information on the scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies for the Philippines will be available at www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/PHSession27.aspx.
[2] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.5-129.6, 129.23, 130.1, 131.1-131.4, 131.6-131.8, 131.11, 131.14-131.15 and 131.23.
[3] United Nations country team submission for the universal periodic review of the Philippines, p. 3, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 130.1 (State of Palestine).
[4] See www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?LangID=E&NewsID=16033. See also CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, paras. 31-32. See also United Nations country team submission, p. 3.
[5] UNHCR submission for the universal periodic review of the Philippines, pp. 1 and 5.
[6] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, para. 60, CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, para. 24 (e), and CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 55.
[7] See CMW/C/PHL/CO/2, para. 17.
[8] See CRC/C/OPSC/PHL/CO/1, para. 42.
[9] See www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=21045&La
[10] OHCHR, "Donor profiles", in *OHCHR Report 2015*, p. 113.
[11] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.1-129.4, 129.10, 129.19, 129.21, 130.2, 130.5, 131.9-131.10, 131.12-131.13, 131.16-131.17, 131.27, 131.30 and 131.33-131.35.
[12] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, paras. 10-11. See also CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 5.
[13] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 9-10.
[14] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, para. 34 (a). See also CEDAW/C/OP.8/PHL/1, para. 51 (g), CMW/C/PHL/CO/2, para. 27 (b), and CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 7.
[15] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 7. See also CEDAW/C/OP.8/PHL/1, para. 51 (g).
[16] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 17-18.
[17] UNICEF submission for the universal periodic review of the Philippines, para. 2, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.10.
[18] See UNICEF submission, para. 3.
[19] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.7-129.8.
[20] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 19-20.
[21] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 10.
[22] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 14 (b).
[23] Ibid., paras. 12-13. See also CEDAW/C/OP.8/PHL/1, para. 51 (c).
[24] See CEDAW/C/OP.8/PHL/1, para. 51 (a).
[25] See UNICEF submission, para. 6.
[26] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.45 and 130.8.
[27] See A/HRC/31/51/Add.1, para. 64.
[28] Ibid., para. 55.
[29] Ibid., para. 56.
[30] United Nations country team submission, p. 12.
[31] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 8.
[32] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.12-129.14, 129.18, 129.20, 129.22, 129.24-129.25, 129.35, 130.3-130.4, 131.16, 131.18 and 131.24-131.26.
[33] United Nations country team submission, p. 2, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.13 (Germany, France and Trinidad and Tobago).
[34] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 14. See also country team submission, p. 2, and CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, para. 23.
[35] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, para. 7.
[36] Ibid., paras. 37 and 38 (b).
[37] Ibid., paras. 21-22 (a).
[38] Ibid., para. 27.
[39] Ibid., para. 27.
[40] Ibid., para. 29.
[41] Ibid., para. 27.

[47] See A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.34.
[48] United Nations country team submission, p. 3, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.34 (Ecuador and Germany).
[49] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.26-129.34, 131.20-131.22 and 131.31.
[50] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, paras. 13 and 14 (f).
[51] See CRC/C/OPSC/PHL/CO/1, para. 38 (e).
[52] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, para. 15. See also para. 17 and CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 17.
[53] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, para. 18 (b)-(d).
[54] Ibid., para. 25.
[55] Ibid., para. 26 (b).
[56] Ibid., paras. 11-12.
[57] Ibid., paras. 13-14.
[58] Ibid., paras. 9-10.
[59] See UNICEF submission, para. 14. See also country team submission, p. 5.
[60] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, paras. 41 and 42 (b).
[61] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, paras. 41 and 42 (b).
[62] See www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=21052&LangID=E.
[63] See CRC/C/OPSC/PHL/CO/1, para. 29 (a).
[64] United Nations country team submission, p. 5, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para 131.20 (Norway), and A/HRC/21/12/Add.1, para. 3 (e).
[65] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 131.32.
[66] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 21.
[67] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 11-12.
[68] See A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.35.
[69] United Nations country team submission, p. 5.
[70] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 15.
[71] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, paras. 31 and 32 (b).
[72] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.23 and 130.3-130.4.
[73] See A/HRC/23/48/Add.3, para. 4.
[74] Ibid., para. 9.
[75] Ibid., para. 16.
[76] Ibid., para. 12.
[77] Ibid., para. 14.
[78] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, paras. 27 (a) and 28 (b).
[79] See UNICEF submission para. 7, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.22 (Norway).
[80] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, paras. 29-30.
[81] See CRC/C/OPSC/PHL/CO/1, para. 25 (c).
[82] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 25 (d).
[83] United Nations country team submission, p. 4, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 130.4 (Uruguay, Indonesia and Brunei Darussalam).
[84] See CRC/C/OPSC/PHL/CO/1, para. 37 (e).
[85] Ibid., para. 23.
[86] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.11 and 129.38-129.39.
[87] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.36.
[88] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 27-28.
[89] United Nations country team submission, p. 2.
[90] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 29-30.
[91] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 35 (b) and (c).
[92] Ibid., para. 35 (a).
[93] Ibid., paras. 35 (d) and 36 (c)-(d).
[94] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.36-129.37.
[95] See UNICEF submission, paras. 17-18.
[96] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 31-32.
[97] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.36-129.37.
[98] See A/HRC/31/51/Add.1, para. 25.

[96] Ibid., para. 28.
[97] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 45-46.
[98] See A/HRC/31/51/Add.1, para. 60.
[99] Ibid., para. 65 (a).
[100] Ibid., para. 65 (b)-(c).
[101] Ibid., para. 16.
[102] Ibid., paras. 17-18.
[103] Ibid., para. 21.
[104] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 45-46.
[105] Ibid., paras. 49-50.
[106] Ibid.
[107] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.40-129.41.
[108] See UNICEF submission, para. 21, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.40 (Switzerland and Sweden).
[109] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 39.
[110] Ibid., para. 39 (e).
[111] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.38 (Qatar and Viet Nam).
[112] United Nations country team submission, p. 7.
[113] See UNICEF submission, para. 22, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.41 (Slovakia and New Zealand).
[114] See CEDAW/C/OP.8/PHL/1, para. 51 (e).
[115] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.42-129.43.
[116] See UNICEF submission, para. 25, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.42 (Saudi Arabia and Holy See). See also country team submission, p. 8, and UNESCO submission, para. 38.
[117] See UNESCO submission, para. 90.
[118] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 33 (a)-(b).
[119] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, paras. 129.7-129.8.
[120] United Nations country team submission, p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.11 (Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago and Argentina).
[121] United Nations country team submission, p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.10 (Brunei Darussalam and Cambodia).
[122] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 12.
[123] Ibid., paras. 49 (a) and 50 (a).
[124] Ibid., para. 25 (a).
[125] Ibid., paras. 25 (b) and 26 (a).
[126] Ibid., para. 26 (b). See also CEDAW/C/57/D/34/2011, para. 9 (b) (i), and CRC/C/OPSC/PHL/CO/1, paras. 9-10.
[127] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, paras. 23 and 24 (b).
[128] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 12. See also CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 49 (b).
[129] See CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 11.
[130] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 43.
[131] Ibid., para. 45 (b).
[132] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 131.5.
[133] See UNICEF submission, para. 2, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.10 (Brunei Darussalam and Cambodia).
[134] Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict submission for the universal periodic review of the Philippines, pp. 1-2.
[135] See UNICEF submission, paras. 10-12, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.25 (Chile).
[136] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, paras. 41 and 42 (a).
[137] See UNICEF submission, para. 4, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.24 (Portugal, France, Uruguay and Liechtenstein).
[138] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 37-38.
[139] See CAT/C/PHL/CO/3, para. 37.
[140] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 130.6.
[141] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 21-22.

[140] See UNICEF submission, para. 29, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 130.6 (Spain).
[141] See A/HRC/31/51/Add.1, para. 52.
[142] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 49-50.
[143] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 129.44.
[144] See A/HRC/31/51/Add.1, para. 35. See also country team submission, pp. 9-10.
[145] See A/HRC/31/51/Add.1, para. 37.
[146] See E/C.12/PHL/CO/5-6, paras. 13-14.
[147] See A/HRC/32/35/Add.3, para. 70.
[148] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para. 130.7.
[149] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, paras. 37 and 38 (b)-(c). See also CMW/C/PHL/CO/2, para. 21 (b).
[150] See CMW/C/PHL/CO/2, para. 31.
[151] Ibid., para. 33 (b).
[152] Ibid., paras. 36-37. See also CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 22.
[153] See CMW/C/PHL/CO/2, paras. 28-29.
[154] UNHCR submission, p. 6, where UNHCR made a recommendation. See also Country team submission, p. 11.
[155] See A/HRC/32/35/Add.3, para. 15.
[156] Ibid., para. 92.
[157] Ibid., para. 99.
[158] Ibid., para. 98.
[159] Ibid., paras. 39-69.
[160] Ibid., para. 104.
[161] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, para 129.9 (Portugal).
[162] UNHCR submission, p. 5.
[163] UNHCR submission, p. 3, referring to A/HRC/21/12 and Corr.1-2, 129.9 (Portugal).
[164] UNHCR submission, p. 3.
[165] Ibid., p. 4.
[166] See CRC/C/OPSC/PHL/CO/1, para. 21 (b).
[167] See CMW/C/PHL/CO/2, para. 34.
[168] United Nations country team submission, p. 11.
[169] See CEDAW/C/PHL/CO/7-8, para. 8. See also CCPR/C/PHL/CO/4, para. 3 (a).

United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/27/PHL/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 February 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-seventh session
1–12 May 2017

Summary of stakeholders' submissions - the Philippines*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights[1]

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 53 stakeholders' submissions[2] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by the accredited national human rights institution in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. CHRP stated that the Philippines had not ratified ICPPED, OP-CRPD, OP-ICESCR, OP-CRC-IC, and the ILO Convention 169 on the Indigenous and Tribal People's Convention, as well as the ASEAN Convention against Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children.[3]

3. CHRP referred to relevant supported recommendations,[4] and stated that the charter to strengthen the Commission and to enable it to fully perform its constitutional task of protecting and promoting human rights had been "languishing in the legislative mill", which had put into question the Government's commitment to nurture the independence and fiscal autonomy of CHRP.[5]

4. CHRP stated that President Rodrigo Duterte as well as the Speaker of the House of Representatives had announced the inclusion of the restoration of the death penalty on the

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

legislative agenda of the 17th Congress, which was contrary to the obligations of the Philippines as a state party to ICCPR-OP2.[6]

5. CHRP expressed concern about statements that had been made by President Rodrigo Duterte and seconded by the Chief of the Philippine National Police that may have emboldened some members of the security sector and vigilantes to kill with impunity.[7] CHRP stated that right to life may have been severely compromised by the Government's war against drugs;[8] and that extrajudicial killings have recently exacerbated.[9]

6. CHRP stated that torture was still being perpetrated by the police. [10] The bill creating a national preventative mechanism for torture remained pending before Congress.[11]

7. CHRP stated that the law on reproductive health had not being uniformly implemented and expressed alarm at the withdrawal of contraceptives in the City of Sirosogon.[12] Furthermore, there had been challenges in the delivery of reproductive health services due to religious and cultural resistance.[13]

8. CHRP expressed concern about the plight of internally displaced persons and urged the authorities to adopt a rights-based approach to development and permanent resettlement.[14]

9. CHRP stated that there the Government had appeared to have reversed its position on the Paris Agreement.[15]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[16]

10. JS1 recommended the ratification of ICPPED.[17] It recalled that at the Universal Periodic Review of the Philippines in 2012 (2012 Review),[18] eight states (Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Japan, France, Chile, Spain, and Iraq) had made recommendations to that effect and also similar recommendations had been made by Slovenia and Mexico at the earlier review in 2008,[19] all of which had not been supported. This was a departure from the official statement that had been delivered by the Philippines during its candidature to the Human Rights Council in 2007 in which a voluntary pledge had been made to strengthen domestic support for the ratification of ICPPED and CRPD.[20]

11. JS2 recommended ratification of ILO Convention No. 169.[21]

12. CMA called for the ratification of ILO Conventions 181 and 29.[22]

13. CTUHR called for the ratification of OP-ICESCR as recommended by Portugal, Germany and Palestine.[23]

14. Referring to a relevant noted recommendation from the 2012 Review,[24] JS14 called for the full cooperation with the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council.[25]

15. JS2 recommended that the Philippines issue a standing invitation to the Special Procedures and working groups of the Human Rights Council.[26]

16. JS1 referred to a request by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances to visit the Philippines and recommended that the Government grant this request.[27]

B. National human rights framework[28]

17. Karapatan stated that there was a lack of effective and substantive implementation of the international and domestic human rights framework adopted by the Government.[29]

18. NCCP referred to relevant supported recommendations and stated that the national human rights action plan had never been publicized and had not been fully observed by the state security forces.[30]

19. AI stated that CHRP faced difficulties in fulfilling its mandate due to capacity and operational challenges, including insufficient budget.[31]

20. JS4 recommended strengthening the role of CHRP to include investigating human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity.[32]

21. JS8 stated that the sovereignty of the Philippines was compromised with the "Enhanced Defence Cooperation Agreement" which allowed a third country to maintain military bases in the Philippines.[33]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[34]

22. JS4 stated that the 1987 Constitution did not explicitly mention sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds for protection, making subsequent policies and programmes non-responsive to the various forms of discrimination against LGBTIQ persons.[35]

23. JS13 stated that transgender persons will continue to suffer discrimination as long as there was no law or policy enabling them to change their name and civil status.[36]

24. JS4 stated that the Reproductive Health Law and its corresponding programmes did not cater for the reproductive health needs of lesbian, transgender and intersex persons,[37] who experienced discrimination due to the non-recognition of same-sex partnerships.[38]

25. JS11 stated that there had been a rise in the on-line abuse of the LGBTIQ community which had taken the form of hate speech, harassment and bullying.[39] JS4 stated that hate crimes had been treated as "ordinary" crimes and recommended the adoption of legislation specifically criminalizing hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity.[40] JS6 stated that bullying of children were on the rise.[41]

26. JS13 called for the prosecution of alleged violations of the rights of LGBT persons, which were fuels by conservative religious beliefs.[42]

Development[43] *and environment*

27. IBON stated that despite years of rapid economic growth in the Philippines, the wealth and profits of a few have increased while the largest part of the population did not have a decent livelihood, with poverty remaining deep and widespread.[44]

28. JS2 stated that mining-related human rights violations have dramatically increased since the 2012 Review. Mining projects often caused widespread damage to the environment. Pursuant to the Mining Act of 1995, mining companies had extensive rights to cut timber and on the use of water, which compromised the social and economic rights of the indigenous communities.[45]

Human rights and counter-terrorism

29. CRCN-P called for an end to the counter-insurgency programme referred to as "Operation Plan Bayanihan" which had claimed the lives of many children.[46] Karapatan stated that the military operations conducted under this programme resulted in the massive displacement of communities in rural areas.[47]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[48]

30. JS19 noted that the death penalty had been abolished in 2006 and stated that on 1 July 2016 a bill had been introduced before the 17th Congress to restore the death penalty.[49]

31. AHCR noted the restrictive definition of extrajudicial killings in the Administrative Order No. 35 issued in 2013, and recommended the enactment of legislation defining extrajudicial killings in line with internationally recognized standards.[50]

32. NCCP referred to supported recommendations on extrajudicial killings and enforced disappearances and stated that the massive law and order campaign targeting those allegedly involved in illegal drug related activities had resulted in an alarming numbers of deaths by the police and by unknown individuals. Those deaths had not been adequately investigated, the appropriateness of the police conduct had not been determined, and unknown assailants had not been apprehended.[51]

33. JS10 referred to the relevant supported recommendations from the 2008 Review and 2012 Review,[52] and expressed concerns over the Government's failure to implement those recommendations.[53] AI also referred to relevant supported recommendations and stated that it continued to receive reports of unlawful killings by both state and non-state actors.[54]

34. AHRC stated that progress in resolving cases of extrajudicial killings had been slow due to impunity and lack of accountability of the authorities allegedly responsible for such killings.[55]

35. JS2 stated that President Rodrigo Duterte had issued the police with an explicit shoot-to-kill order in relation to persons allegedly involved in the drug trade and recommended retracting that order.[56]

36. TCC stated that President Rodrigo Duterte had publically condoned and encouraged extrajudicial killings of alleged criminals by promising pardons for any law enforcement officials convicted of killing anyone resisting arrest.[57] JS12 stated that such statements constituted incitement to kill.[58]

37. JS1 stated that President Rodrigo Duterte's programme to curb drug-related crimes was reminiscent of the methods of the Davao Death Squads that operated in Davao City where he had served as Mayor.[59]

38. PCPR stated that the almost three-thousand people killed under this so-called "war on drugs" was a manifestation of the State's disregard for the right to life.[60] HRW stated that President Rodrigo Duterte had ignored calls for an official probe into those killings and had instead praised the killings as proof of the success of his anti-drug campaign and had urged the police to seize the momentum. The Chief of the Philippine National Police, Director-General Ronald dela Rosa, had rejected calls for an investigation saying that it was "legal harassment," and that it "dampens the morale" of police officers. The Solicitor-General Jose Calida, had also defended the legality of the killings.[61]

39. JS1 stated that at the 2012 Review, the Philippines had supported all recommendations relating to "broad actions" towards ending enforced disappearance[62] while recommendations relating to concrete actions had been noted.[63]

40. AI referred to relevant supported recommendations,[64] and noted the enactment of the Anti-Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances Act in 2012, but stated that there had not been any convictions under the Act.[65] JS1 commended the enactment of the Act, but stated that it had not been effectively implemented.[66]

41. JS1 stated that the majority of the cases of enforced disappearance had been politically motivated. It recommended including enforced disappearance on the agenda of the peace process involving the Government and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines.[67]

42. JS17 stated that torture had remained pervasive and the continued use of secret detention had remained a key obstacle to exposing this crime. The alleged perpetrators had been police officers, the security forces, prison officials, local executive officers, paramilitary groups and local peace keepers.[68] While the supported recommendations provided a roadmap for combating torture, there was limited action towards their implementation and the efforts undertaken were insufficient to have a positive impact.[69]

43. JS17 stated that the Anti-Torture Act had not been diligently implemented.[70]

44. AI stated that a national preventive mechanism, as required under OP-CAT, had not been established in accordance with a commitment made during the 2012 Review.[71]

45. JS17 stated that most torture victims had not received rehabilitation due to the lack of political willingness to take responsibility for and adequately fund the Comprehensive Program for the Rehabilitation of Torture Victims and their Families.[72]

46. The NCCP stated that the prison system had been subjected to unacceptable overcrowding, which has been further aggravated by the 'war on drugs'. Prisons were no longer able to ensure the health and safety of prisoners or meet minimal standards under international law.[73]

47. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation,[74] JS2 stated that even though the number of private armed groups had fallen from 107 in 2010 to 81 in 2013, this number has since risen to 85 leading up to the May 2016 elections, which did not include armed groups legitimized as Civilian Volunteer Organizations, Special CAFGU Active Auxiliary units, or "force multipliers"[75]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[76]

48. NCCP referred to relevant supported recommendations on reforming the judicial system and stated that the judicial system remained open to manipulation, and was exceedingly slow in delivering justice.[77]

49. JS3 stated that the long court process exacerbated by the postponement of hearings, and the absence of judges, prosecutors and attorneys had often lead to pro-longed trauma for child victims of sexual abuse.[78] The child-friendly procedures including the rules on the examination of child witnesses had not being implemented and only a few courts had used the video conferencing technology that allowed for the testimony of children to be taken outside the court room.[79] Many prosecutors and judges had not received the training prescribed by the Family Courts Acts of 1997.[80]

50. JS6 stated that bills seeking to lower the minimum age of criminal responsibility from fifteen to nine years had been filed during the 17th Congress. It opposed the lowering of the minimum age of criminal responsibility.[81]

51. JS12 stated that local town, village and law enforcement officials had compiled lists of alleged drug users and suppliers and those persons had been made to confess to either being a drug user or a drug supplier, which had violated their right to due process.[82]

77. CTUHR stated that one out of every 3 employees held flexible employment, which violated the right to security and tenure.[126]

78. CTUHR stated that in the manufacturing sector a "quota system" existed which drove workers to work beyond their physical capacity in order to meet the quota and earn the minimum wage.[127] In 2012, the Government issued the DOLE Department Order 118-12 that implemented a two-tiered wage system, which reduced the wage.[128]

79. CTUHR stated that corporations were exploiting Republic Act 7686, Dual Training Act of 1994 by employing students and youth workers as trainees to do the jobs of regular workers and paying them 75 percent of prescribed minimum wage and not providing insurance.[129]

80. JS8 stated that many big companies had offered work on a contractual basis were employees had been employed for five months per year had not received social protection, health insurance and other benefits.[130] Employers had rarely complied with labour safety standards.[131]

81. JS8 stated that the thousands of women who had worked as farm workers on big plantations had received wages much lower than their male counter-parts.[132]

82. CTUHR stated that unsafe and unhealthful conditions characterized workplaces as companies' compliance to occupational safety and health standards were made voluntary.[133]

83. CMA stated that the Philippines had deployed more than a million workers abroad.[134] Staff working in the Philippine missions abroad must know how to respond to the needs of those workers.[135]

84. MIGRANTE stated that the concerned embassies did little or nothing to secure the rights of 35 overseas Filipinos workers who had either been convicted or were on trial for crimes in third countries.[136]

85. CTUHR stated that a climate of violence and intimidation against trade unions had persisted.[137]

Right to social security[138]

86. JS1 called for adequate and effective support for the families of disappeared persons, which included livelihood assistance.[139]

Right to an adequate standard of living[140]

87. JS8 referred to relevant supported recommendations[141] and stated that the Conditional Cash Transfer Programme, the Government's flagship anti-poverty programme had failed to make a dent on the poverty crisis.[142] JS8 stated that poverty aggravated the low social and economic status of women.[143]

88. KMP stated that the country was subservient to the policies of the World Trade Organisation which had resulted in an increased dependence on food importation, an abandonment of state subsidies for food production and an allocation of vast tracts of land for production of crops for export.[144]

89. JS6 stated that the malnutrition among children remained a great concern. Referring to relevant recommendations from the 2012 Review,[145] JS6 recommended that the Philippines enact of the "First 1000 Days Bill" to ensure effective nutrition programmes.[146]

90. DJP cited cases of forced eviction[147] and called on the Government to refrain from such practices and to focus on developing the existing urban communities.[148]

91. JS8 stated that seven out of ten farmers remained landless.[149] It recommended providing land to all qualified tenant farmers with attention to households headed by women.[150]

92. KMP stated that the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program and its Reforms which ended in 2014 had been a failure leaving farming and fishing the poorest sectors in the country.[151] KMP called for a new redistributive land reform programme based on social justice.[152]

Right to health[153]

93. AI referred to relevant supported recommendations,[154] and stated that the Philippines had taken positive steps, including adopting the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act, the Domestic Workers Act and the Expanded Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act. However, the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act had suffered from inconsistent implementation across the country, and there was no mechanism to monitor the implementation of the Act.[155]

94. AI stated that repealing the provisions of the the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act which the Supreme Court had ruled to be unconstitutional, would be in consistent with the international obligations of the Philippines, including Article 12 of CEDAW and Article 12 of ICESCR.[156] JS20 stated that the Act required the consent of male spouses in order for women to access reproductive health procedures and prohibited minors from availing of modern methods of family planning without parental consent, both of which defeated the purpose of addressing teenage pregnancy and empowering women to uphold their sexual and reproductive health rights.[157]

95. JS6 stated that the high incidence of teenage pregnancy was attributed to the lack of access to age-appropriate and comprehensive sexual education, as well as to a lack of adolescent-friendly reproductive health services.[158] JS6 stated that at the 2012 Review, the Philippines had commited to ensuring access to sexual and reproductive health, education and counselling[159] and recommended removing the legal barriers to full access to sexual and reproductive health services for girls and boys.[160]

96. JS7 stated that despite legislative guarantees of contraceptive information and services, there were two executive orders in Manila which banned modern contraceptives in all public health care facilities.[161]

97. AI stated that due to the ban on abortion, clandestine abortions remained widespread, resulting in maternal mortality and morbidity and disability of women.[162] JS7 recommended decriminalizing abortion and ensuring that women and girls have access to humane, non-judgmental and quality post-abortion care.[163]

98. ADF stated that the right to life of the unborn was constitutionally protected and abortion was illegal.[164] It called for continued protection for the unborn and assistance for pregnant women.[165]

99. JS8 stated that health and medical services had remained inaccessible for many poor women. Public hospitals had continued to be ill-equipped and understaffed.[166] JS13 called for emergency obstetric facilities for all women including rural, indigenous and Muslim women.[167]

100. HRW stated that there had been a sharp rise in HIV infections as a consequence of government policies, compounded by the resistance of the Catholic Church and other entities to sexual health education and the use of condoms.[168] JS13 attributed the increase of HIV infections to a "lack of access to sexuality education".[169] There was also a lack of post-exposure prophylaxis and there were no protocols in relation to rape victims.[170]

Right to education[171]

101. IBON stated that although tuition-free education was provided at the primary and secondary levels in public schools, the high non-tuition expenses denied millions of children their right to a decent education.[172]

102. JS6 stated that children in marginalized communities, such as those in informal urban settlements and relocation sites, hazard-prone areas and indigenous communities experienced many barriers to education. The relocation sites had no schools and children had to walk long distances to the nearest school. Class rooms were heavily congested. The education system was not culturally sensitive resulting in the marginalization of indigenous persons.[171]

103. ERI expressed concern at the high rates of children who had not gone to school and who had dropped out of school.[172]

104. ERI stated that although there are some schools located in indigenous communities, most of the facilities were improvised compared to other Government public schools.[173]

105. GG called for the creation of a national action plan for human rights education.[174]

4 Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[175]

106. JS20 stated that women were kept systematically and historically disadvantaged.[176] Sexist and patriarchal views, values, and practices were deeply entrenched in the culture of the society, which were reinforced by different influential institutions.[177]

107. JS20 stated that women had always been at the bottom of development priorities. From 2006 to 2012, poverty incidence among women had been pegged at 26 percent, clearly indicating absence of economic progress among most women.[178]

108. GABRIELA stated that the counter-insurgency programme, "Oplan Bayanihan", resulted in massive human rights violations and heinous cases of violence against women, particularly in indigenous, rural and urban poor communities.[179]

109. JS11 stated that the internet had become a tool for violence against women in the form of pornography, amongst others.[180]

Children[181]

110. JS6 referred to supported recommendations on corporal punishment from the 2012 Review,[182] and recommended the passage of the the "Anti-Corporal Punishment/Positive Discipline Act" in the 17th Congress and the promotion of positive forms of discipline for children.[183]

111. JS3 stated that the Philippines had not acted on supported recommendations in relation to child abuse, particularly sexual abuse.[184]

112. JS3 referred to the Anti-Rape Law of 1997 (RA8353) and recommended removing a subsequent marriage to extinguish any criminal action and more serious penalties for perpetrators who were persons of trust or authority over the children.[185]

113. Salinlahi stated that an increasing number of children had been forced into child pornography and other related commercial sexual activities.[186] JS3 recommended including topics on the prevention of child abuse in the school curriculum.[187]

114. JS6 stated that the high level of engagement of children in cyberspace, along with weak regulation of cyberspace use and content, had made them highly vulnerable to online violence. The Philippines had been considered a major global source for the child cybersex industry.[188]

115. JS6 stated that the conflict in Mindanao had caused frequent displacement and evacuation creating the fear among children of being separated from their families.[189] JS6 recommended enacting the law on the rights of children in armed conflict, as a follow up to the commitments that had been made in the 2012 Review.[190]

116. CHCN-P stated that 18 children had been falsely identified as child soldiers and illegally detained and subjected to torture, harassment and intimidation.[193]

Persons with disabilities[194]

117. JS20 stated that women and girls with disability were more vulnerable to all forms of human rights violations. Gender-based violence had been perpetrated more often against women and girls with disabilities than those without. One in every three deaf women had been sexually harassed or raped.[195]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[196]

118. RMP-NMR stated that legislation including the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act had allowed the legal displacement of the Lumad[197] from their territories. This Act had several loop-holes that have been used against the indigenous peoples.[198]

119. TUC stated that the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act provided for mandatory representation for Indigenous Peoples in policy-making bodies and local legislative councils. Although national guidelines had been enacted in 2009 to create mechanisms to give effect to this representation, no such mechanisms had been created.[199]

120. JS10 stated that the Mining Act of 1995 which provided inter alia for the eviction of indigenous communities violated the collective rights of indigenous people.[200]

121. JS2 stated that free, prior, and informed consent as required by the Indigenous People's Rights Act was frequently not obtained by the mining companies.[201] Indigenous human rights defenders who lead community processes demanding mining companies seek such consent had faced harassment, threats, and attacks.[202]

122. While noting the politically motivated killings of the Indigenous Peoples, particularly the Lumads of Mindanao and the Igorots of the Cordillera,[203] JS10 stated that the killings of Indigenous Peoples and the continuing threats to their leaders have resulted in conflicts, fear and mistrust among the indigenous communities which weakened the Indigenous Peoples' movement for respect and recognition of their collective rights.[204]

23. JS10 stated that the individual and collective rights of the Indigenous Peoples were violated by the "militarization of their territories". The military were permanently based within these territories and conducted operations including unwarranted searches of homes, imposition of food blockages and curfews.[205]

124. NCCP stated that the activities of the military and the para-military groups have brought immense suffering to the Lumad communities of eastern Mindanao, which included the raiding of schools and villages, extrajudicial killings, and the displacement of thousands of Indigenous People.[206]

125. JS2 stated that attacks against independent indigenous schools in Mindanao perpetrated by the military and paramilitary groups intensified in 2015.[207]

126. UIC stated that indigenous children lacked equal access to education.[208] The school curriculum was not culturally responsive and appropriate for indigenous children.[209]

127. JS18 stated that there was a lack of support for indigenous education schools and a lack of teacher training courses on indigenous education at the universities.[210]

128. JS16 stated that the lack of land had remained a problem for the Bangsamoro, with the majority of the population still landless.[211] It also stated that in the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao about 70 percent of the people lived below the poverty line, and had been denied basic services, such as health and education.[212]

129. JS20 stated that the indigenous women's lack of economic power in a patriarchal society had contributed to their subjugation by their spouses.[213]

130. JS20 stated that indigenous women had been adversely affected by the "No Home Birthing Policy" as they had no access to birthing facilities.[214]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[215]

131. JS9 stated that the conditions at the Bagong Diwa Immigration Detention Centre in Bicutan were appalling, particularly as the living space was insufficient, the food was of a poor quality and insufficient quantity and there was no medical assistance.[216]

5. Specific regions or territories

132. PCPR commended the Government for pursing formal peace talks with the National Democratic Front of the Philippines and for opening the door for informal talks both with Moro National Liberation Front and Moro Islamic Liberation Front.[217]

133. JS16 stated that despite the signing of the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro in October 2012 and the Comprehensive Agreement on the Bangsamoro in March 2014, the Moro communities continued to be repeatedly attached and displaced by military operations.[218]

Notes

[1] The following abbreviations have been used in the present document:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

[2] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Joint submissions

JS1	Asian Federation against Involuntary Disappearances (AFAD) and families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance (FIND) (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Aktionsbündnis Menschenrechte – Philippinen (AMP) comprising of Amnesty International Germany, Bread for the World – Protestant

	Development Service, International Peace Observers Network (IPON), MISEREOR, Missio Munich, philippinenbüro e.V. im Asienhaus, and the United Evangelical Mission, Cologne, Germany, (Joint Submission 2);
JS3	Apprentis d'Auteuil Foundation, CAMELEON Association Inc., Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Sexual Abuse, and Action Against Violence and Exploitation, Inc. , Paris, France (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	ASEAN Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) Caucus, Association of Transgender People of the Philippines, Babaylanes, Inc, GALANG Philippines, LGBTS Christian Church Inc, Metropolitan Community Church of Marikina City, Metro Manila Pride, MUJER-LGBT Organization, PDRC/ Deaf Resources Philippines, SHINE SOCCSKSARGEN Inc., Side B Philippines, The Philippine LGBT Chamber of Commerce, TLF Share, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 4);
JS5	CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation and Karapatan – Alliance for the Advancement of People's Rights, Johannesburg, South Africa (Joint Submission 5);
JS6	The Civil Society Coalition on the Convention on the Rights of the Child composed of Child Hope Asia, Fundacion Educacion Y Cooperacion, Good Neighbors International Philippines, John J. Carroll Institute on Church and Social Issues), Kindernothilfe Ev. Philippines, Open Heart Foundation, Philippines Against Child Trafficking, Plan Philippines, Unang Hakbang Foundation, VIDES Philippines Volunteers Foundation Inc., and World Vision Development Foundation, Inc. (Joint Submission 6);
JS7	Catholics for Reproductive Health, Center for Reproductive Rights, EnGendeRights Inc., Filipino Freethinkers, Population Services Pilipinas Inc.,Woman Health Philippines Inc., Women's Global Network for Reproductive Rights (Joint Submission 7);
JS8	Center for Women's Resources and General Assembly Binding Women for Reforms, Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Action (Joint Submission 8);
JS9	Human Rights Without Frontiers and Forum for Religious Freedom , Soignies, Belgium (Joint submission 9);
JS10	Franciscans International, Edmund Rice International, Franciscans Solidarity Movement for Justice, Peace and Integrity of Creation, Geneva, Switzerland (Joint Submission 10);
JS11	Foundation for Media Alternatives, Association for Progressive Communications and Women's Legal and human Rights Bureau, Quezon City, Philippines (Joint Submission 11);
JS12	Philippine Alliance of Human Rights Advocates, No Box Transitions Foundation, Inc., International Drug Policy Consortium , APCASO, Asian Network of People who Use Drugs London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 12);
JS13	Sexual Rights Network comprising of Family Planning Organization of the Philippines and EnGendeRights, Inc., London United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 13);
JS14	International Service for Human Rights, Medical Action Group and the Philippines Alliance of Huma Rights Advocates, Geneva, Switzerland (Joint Submission 14);
JS15	Katribu Kalipunan ng Katutubong Mamamayan ng Pilipinas, Cordillera Peoples Alliance for the Defense of Ancestral Land and for Self-determination, Kusog sa Katawhang Lumad sa Mindanao, Stop the Killings of Indigenous Peoples Network and Tumanduk nga

	Maguguma Nagapanggapin sa Dato kag Kabuhi , Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 15);
JS16	Moro-Christian Peoples Alliance and KAWAGIB Alliance for the Advancement of Moro Human Rights, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 16);
JS17	B'laan Rehabilitation Centre, Medical Action Group and the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims, Copenhagen, Denmark (Joint Submission 17);
	JS18 Network and partners of the Franciscan Solidarity Movement on Justice and Peace and Integrity of Creation, composed of : Alyansa Tigil Mina, BALAY Rehabilitation Centre, Franciscan Apostolic Sisters IP Ministry, Philippine Misereor Partnership, Inc., Save Sierra Madre Movement, Task Force Detainees of the Philippines, Workers Assistance Centre, Urban Poor Associates, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 18);
JS19	Philippine Alliance of Human Rights Advocates, Children's Legal Research and Development, Medical Action Group, Inc.,Philippine Human Rights Information Centre, Task Force Detainees of the Philippines and United Against Torture Coalition, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 19);
JS20	Women's legal and Human Rights Bureau, Inc. and Philwomen on ASEAN, Quezon City, the Philippines (Joint Submission 20);
JS21	Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers) and the Dominican Family in the Philippines, Geneva, Switzerland;
JS22	Foundation for Media Alternatives and Privacy International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 22);
Individual submissions:	
ADF	ADF International, Geneva, Switzerland;
AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
AHRC	Ateneo Human Rights Center, Makati City, Philippines;
BAYAN	Bagong Alyansang Makabayan (New Patriotic Alliance or BAYAN), Quezon City, the Philippines;
CMA	Center for Migrant Advocacy- Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
COURAGE	Confederation for Unity Recognition and Advancement of Government Employees, Quezon City, the Philippines;
CRCN-P	Children's Rehabilitation Center - Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
CTUHR	Center for Trade Union and Human Rights, Quezon City, the Philippines;
DJP	Defend Job Philippines, Manila, Philippines;
ERI	Edmund Rice International, Geneva, Switzerland;
FFF	Four Freedoms Forum, Kenosha, United States of America;
FLD	Front Line Defenders – The International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Dublin, Ireland;
GABRIELA	GABRIELA National Alliance of Filipino Women, Quezon City, the Philippines;
GG	The Good Group, Honolulu, the United States of America;
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland;
IBON	IBON Foundation, Quezon City, the Philippines;
IND1893	Indigenous 1893, Kenosha, United States of America;
IFI-RPRD	Iglesia Filipina Independiente – Rameno Project for Defenders, Manila, Philippines;
JC	Jubilee Campaign, Fairfax, United States of America;

KARAPATAN	KARAPATAN Alliance for the Advancement of People's Rights, Quezon City, the Philippines;
KMP	The Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas (Peasant Movement of the Philippines), Quezon City, Philippines;
MIGRANTE	Migrante International, Quezon City, the Philippines;
NCCP	National Council of Churches in the Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
NUPL	National Union of Peoples' Lawyers, Quezon City, the Philippines;
OHR	Oceania Human Rights Hawaii, Kailua, United States of America;
PCPR	Promotion of Church People's Response, Quezon City, the Philippines;
RMP-NMR	The Rural Missionaries of the Philippines – Northern Mindanao Sub-Region, Iligan City, the Philippines;
Salinlahi	Salinlahi Alliance for Children's Concern, Quezon City, the Philippines;
TCC	The Carter Center, Atlanta, United States of America;
UCCP	United Church of Christ in the Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines;
National human rights institution:	
CHRP	Commission on Human Rights of The Philippines, Quezon City, the Philippines.

[3] CHRP, para. 33 and endnote 38.
[4] CHRP, para. 10 and endnote 14 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.1 (Egypt, Australia, Russian Federation and Viet Nam) and 131.13 (Iraq).
[5] CHRP, paras. 10 and 11.
[6] CHRP, para. 30. See also JS12, paras. 5.1 and 5.2.
[7] CHRP, para. 4.
[8] CHRP, para. 6.
[9] CHRP, paras. 13-17.
[10] CHRP, para. 26.
[11] CHRP, para. 25.
[12] CHRP, para. 12.
[13] CHRP, para. 34.
[14] CHRP, para. 36.
[15] CHRP, para. 29.
[16] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.5, 129.6, 129.23, 130.1, 131.1-131.4, 131.6-131-8 and 131.11, 131.14, 131.15, 131.23.
[17] JS1, para. 30. See also JS2, para. 37.
[18] See A/HRC/2112.
[19] See A/HRC/8/28, para. 58 (4).
[20] JS1, para. 25 referring to the Note verbal dated 18 April 2007 from the Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly, A/61/882, (26 April 2007).
[21] JS2, para. 56.
[22] CMA, para. 4.2.1.3.
[23] CTUHR, para. 33 and referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.6. The recommendations have been noted (A/HRC/21/12 Add.1, para4(c)).
[24] JS14 p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.32 (Ireland).
[25] JS14, p. 3.
[26] JS2, paras. 57 and 58. See also JS5, para. 6.5.
[27] JS1, paras. 31-36.
[28] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.1, 129.2, 129.3, 129.4, 129.10, 129.19, 129.21, 130.2, 130.5, 131.9, 131.10, 131.12, 131.13, 131.16, 131.17, 131.27, 131.30, 131.33 - 131.35.
[29] Karapatan, para. 4.
[30] NCCP, paras. 10 and 11, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.3 (Palestine and Qatar).
[31] AI, pp. 2-3 and fn. 18 referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.13 (Iraq).
[32] JS4, para.12.6.

[33] JS8, para. 37. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 47.10).
[34] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.7 and 129.8.
[35] JS4, para. 3.1. JS4 made a recommendation (para. 12.1).
[36] JS13, para. 60. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 71.).
[37] JS4, para. 6.2. It made a recommendation (para. 12.9). See also JS13, para. 55.
[38] JS4, para. 9.1.
[39] JS11, para. 40.
[40] JS4, paras. 5.2 and 12.2. See also JS13 para. 56.
[41] JS6, para.11. JS6 made recommendations (para. 13).
[42] JS13, paras. 7 and 8.
[43] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.45 (Myanmar) and 130.8 (Nicaragua).
[44] IBON, para. 1.
[45] JS2, para. 50. See also OHR, p. 2.
[46] CRCN-P, paras. 3 and 29.
[47] Karapatan, paras. 5, 17 and 21. Karapatan made a recommendation (para. 23).
[48] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.12, 129.13, 129.14-129.18, 129.20, 129.22, 129.24, 129.25, 129.35, 130.3, 130.4, 131.18, 131.16, 131.24, 131.25, 131.26.
[49] JS19, para. 26. JS19 made recommendations (paras. 46 and 47); See also JC, paras. D. 1, D.3 and D.4; JS2, paras. 24 and 27.
[50] AHCR, paras. 10 and 37.
[51] NCCP, paras. 3 and 4, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.12 (Republic of Korea, Singapore, and Holy See), 129.13 (Germany, France, Trinidad and Tobago,), 129.14 (Germany), 129.15 (Spain, United States of America), 129.16 (Sweden and Timor-Leste) 131.22 (Switzerland) and A/HRC/21/12/Add.1, para. (3) (f). See also PCPR, para. 5.
[52] For recommendations from the 2008 review see A/HRC/8/28, 23 May 2008, para. 58 (6) (Holy See and Switzerland), read together with A/HRC/8/28/Add.1, 25 August 2008, p. 2, paras. 2 (e) and (f). For recommendations from the 2012 review see A/HRC/21/12, 9 July 2012, paras. 129.13 (France and Trinidad and Tobago), 129.14 (Germany), 129.15 (Spain and the United States of America), 129.16 (Sweden, Timor-Leste and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 129.17 (Republic of Korea and Egypt), 129.28 (Indonesia), 129.29 (Republic of Korea, Austria and the Netherlands), and 129.32 (Canada).
[53] JS10, para. 5.
[54] AI, p. 1 and fn. 1 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.14 (Germany) and 129.15 (Spain and United States of America). AI made recommendations (p. 6).
[55] AHRC, para. 29. AHRC made recommendations (paras. 38-40).
[56] JS2, paras. 21 and 25. See also JS12, para. 2.10. JS12 made recommendations (para. 6.19.); JS19, para.15. JS19 made recommendations (paras. 28-36); JC, para. C. 3. JC made a recommendation (para. E.3); Karapatan, para. 22; TCC p. 1.
[57] TCC, pp.1-2.
[58] JS12, para. 2.9. See also JS19, para. 14; JC, para. C.1.
[59] JS1, para. 19. See also JC, para. C. 2.
[60] PCPR, para. 30. PCPR made a recommendation (para. 30 (1).
[61] HRW, p. 3.
[62] For recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.12 (Republic of Korea, Singapore and Holy See), 129.13(Germany, France and Trinidad and Tobago), 129.15, (Spain and United States of America), 129.16 (Sweden, Timor-Leste and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 129.28 (Indonesia), 129.29 (Republic of Korea, Austria and Netherlands) and 129.35 (France).
[63] For recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 131.1 (Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Japan, France and Chile), 131.12 (Canada), and 131.15 (Norway, Mexico and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). For positions on the recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12/Add.1.
[64] AI, p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.15 (Spain and United States of America) and 129.16 (Sweden and Timor Leste).
[65] AI, p. 1
[66] JS1, paras. 12 and 21-24.
[67] JS1, para. 20.
[68] JS17, para. 6. See also JS19, paras. 5-9. JS19 made recommendations (paras. 37-40), Karapatan, para. 8; HRW, pp. 3-4.

[69] JS17, para. 5. See also JS15, para. 66.
[70] JS17, paras. 13-15. JS17 made recommendations (paras 16 and 17).
[71] AI, p. 1 and fn. 7 referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.21 (France, New Zealand and Denmark. See also NCCP, paras. 12 and 13.
[72] JS17, para. 28. JS17 made recommendations (paras. 34-37).
[73] NCCP, para. 17. NCCP made a recommendation (para. 20 (v). See also JS17, para. 45.
[74] For recommendation see A/HRC/21/12, paras 129.25 (Chile).
[75] JS2, paras. 42 and 43. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 46-49); See also NCCP, paras. 14 and 15; Karapatan, para. 7. Karapatan made a recommendation (para. 24).
[76] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.26-129.34, 131.20-131.22, 131.31.
[77] NCCP, para. 17,referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.29 (Spain, Republic of Korea and the Netherlands). NCCP made a recommendation (para. 20 (iv).
[78] JS3, para. 16.
[79] JS3, para. 27. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 33.4 and 33.7).
[80] JS3, para. 29. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 33.5 and 36.6).
[81] JS6, paras. 33 and 34. JS6 made recommendations (para. 35.). See also Salinlahi, para. 32.
[82] JS12, paras. C, 3.1 - 3.4. See also JS19, para. 23.
[83] Salinlahi, para. 33.
[84] JS2, para. 28, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras 129.15 (United States of America), 129.26 (Spain), 129.29 (Republic of Korea, Austria, Netherlands), 129.30 (Australia). JS2 made recommendations (paras. 36-41).
[85] HRW, p. 5, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.31 (United States of America) and 129.32 (Canada).
[86] IFI-RPRD, para. 18.
[87] NUPL, p. 1, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.30 (Australia).
[88] NUPL, para. 1. NUPL cited cases of impunity (2-7).
[89] AI, p. 2.
[90] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.32.
[91] ADF, paras. 18-23. ADF made recommendations (para. 24).
[92] JC, paras. A. 2 and 3. JC made a recommendation (para. E.1).
[93] UCCP, para. 5.
[94] UCCP, paras. 5-9. UCCP made recommendations (para. 17).
[95] JS11, paras. 14-16. JS11 made recommendations (para. 40).
[96] JS5, paras. 4.2-4.4. JS5 made recommendations (para. 6.3). See also JS11, para. 12; JS2, para. 12. JS2 made a recommendation (17).
[97] NCCP, para. 6., referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.35(France).
[98] JS14, p.1 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.35 (France) and 131.32 (Ireland). For the position taken by the Philippines on the recommendations see A/HRC/21/12/Add.1. See also FLD, para. 5.
[99] JS14, p. 2.
[100] JS2, para. 4. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 8-10). See also JS5, para. 3.1, and Annex referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129. 35, 131.15, 131.31, and 131.32.
[101] FLD, paras. 5 and 6.
[102] FLD, para. 19.
[103] JS2, para. 14. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 18 and 19). See also JS15, paras. 49-51; IFI-RPRD, para. 5; Karapatan, para. 9; NCCP, para. 7.
[104] Karapatan, para. 10. Karapatan made a recommendation (para. 30).
[105] JS5, paras. 3.3 and 6.2. For recommendations see para. 6.2.
[106] JS5, para. 2.2.
[107] JS5, paras. 5.2-5.4. JS5 made recommendations (para. 6.4).
[108] The presidential and general elections were held on 9 May 2016 (TCC, p. 1).
[109] TCC, p. 3.
[110] Those barriers included the remoteness of the locations where they live and the considerable distances they must travel to register or to vote; the high levels of illiteracy which render the voting process highly inaccessible; and the lack of legal documentation to facilitate voter registration (TCC, p. 2).
[111] TCC, p. 2. TCC made a recommendation (p. 3).
[112] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.23, 130.3 and 130.4.
[113] JS6, para. 20.

[114] JS6, para. 22(a) referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.22 (Norway) and 130.3 (Spain, Belarus, Holy See, Netherlands, Uruguay, Latvia).
[115] JS6, para. 22. For other recommendations see para. 22. See also JS21, para. 7.
[116] CMA, para. 8.6.
[117] CMA, para. 8.8.
[118] JS21, para. 10. JS21 made recommendations (para. 11).
[119] JS11, para. 22. JS11 made recommendations (para. 40).
[120] JS22, paras. 13-18. JS22 made recommendations para. 43. See also JS11, paras. 31 and 31.
[121] JS22, paras. 24 and 25. JS22 made recommendations (para. 43).
[122] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.11, 129.38 and 129.39.
[123] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.36.
[124] DJP, paras. 10-12. DJP made recommendations (paras. 30 and 31).
[125] COURAGE, paras. 1-4. COURAGE made recommendations (p. 7).
[126] CTUHR, paras. 4, 5 and 7. CTUHR made recommendations (para. 33 (ii)). See also JS20, para. 4.
[127] CTUHR, para. 13.
[128] CTUHR, para. 15.
[129] CTUHR, para. 16.
[130] JS8, paras. 18-20.
[131] JS8, para. 23. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 47.5).
[132] JS8, para. 24. See also CTUHR, para. 17; GABRIELA, para. 8.
[133] CTUHR, para. 20, referring to the DOLE Department Order 131-13, (2013) Rules on Labor Law Compliance System.
[134] CMA, para. 1.1.
[135] CMA, para. 6.1. CMA made proposals (paras. 6.2-6.9).
[136] MIGRANTE, pp. 3-4. MIGRANT made recommendations (pp. 5-6.).
[137] CTUHR, paras. 23 and 25.
[138] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.36 and 129.37.
[139] JS1, para. 14.
[140] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.36 and 129.37.
[141] For recommendations see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129. 36 (Bangladesh, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and Russian Federation) and 129.37 (Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia and United Arab Emirates).
[142] JS8, para. 12. JS8 made a recommendation (para. 47.8). See also GABRIELA, para. 5; and Salinilahi, para. 41.
[143] JS8, p. 1. See also GABRIELA, para. 7.
[144] KMP, p. 1.
[145] For recommendations see A/HRC/21/12 referring to paras. 129.38 (Qatar and Viet Nam) and 129.39 (Cuba and Pakistan).
[146] JS6, paras 41-43. JS6 also made other recommendations (para. 43).
[147] See DJP, paras. 27 – 29.
[148] DJP, para. 6. DJP made recommendations (paras. 35 and 36).
[149] JS8, para. 14.
[150] JS8, para. 47.8.
[151] KMP, p. 1.
[152] KMP, para. 3.
[153] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.40 and 129.41.
[154] AI, p. 2 and fn. 12 referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.7 (Spain), 129.40 (Switzerland and Sweden) and 129.41 (Slovakia and New Zealand.
[155] AI, p. 2. AI made recommendations (p. 6).
[156] AI, p. 5.
[157] JS20, para. 36.
[158] JS6, para. 45.
[159] JS6 referred to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.40 (Sweden) and 129.41 (New Zealand).
[160] JS6, para. 47. For other recommendations made see para. 47.
[161] JS7, para. 9. JS7 made recommendations (para. 28).
[162] AI, p. 5.
[163] JS7, p. 3. See also JS13, para. 43.

[164] ADF, paras. 3-6.
[165] ADF, para. 17. ADF made recommendations (para. 24).
[166] JS8, pars. 28-30.
[167] JS13, para. 18.
[168] HRW, p. 8.
[169] JS13, para. 13.
[170] JS13, para. 16. JS13 made a recommendation (para. 16).
[171] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.42 and 129.43.
[172] IBON, para. 34.
[173] JS6, paras. 36-39. JS6 made recommendations and that context referred to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.42 (Saudi Arabia and Holy See).
[174] ERI, paras. 12-13.
[175] ERI, para. 10.
[176] GG, p. 2
[177] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.7 and 129.8.
[178] JS20, p. 2.
[179] JS20, para. 4. JS20 made recommendations (para. 41).
[180] JS20, para. 3.
[181] GABRIELA, paras. 11 and (i). GABRIELA made recommendations (para. ii).
[182] (JS11, para. 17. JS 11 made recommendations (para. 40).
[183] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 131.5.
[184] For recommendations see A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.24 (Portugal, France, Uruguay and Liechtenstein).
[185] JS6, para.19.
[186] JS3, para. 5, referring to A/HRC/21/12, paras. 129.10 (Brunei Darussalam), 129. 24 (France and Uruguay), 129.29 (Republic of Korea and the Netherlands).
[187] JS3, paras. 33.2 and 33.3.
[188] Salinlahi, para. 29.
[189] JS3, paras. 36 and 38.13.
[190] JS6, paras. 23 and 24. JS6 made recommendations (para. 28).
[191] JS6, para. 30.
[192] JS6, para. 32 referring to A/HRC/21/12, para.129.25 (Chile). For other recommendations see para. 32.
[193] CRCN-P, para. 7.
[194] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 130.6.
[195] JS20, para. 14.
[196] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.44.
[197] The collective term used for the indigenous peoples of Mindanao (RMP-NMR, fn.1).
[198] RMP-NMR, para. 5. RMP-NMR made a recommendation (para. 33).
[199] TCC, p. 2. TCC made a recommendation (p. 3). See also RMP-NMR, para. 31. RMP-NMR made a recommendation (para. 38).
[200] JS10, para. 11.
[201] See also JS18, p. 3.
[202] JS2, para. 50. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 53 and 54).
[203] JS10, paras. 14-19.
[204] JS10, para. 20. JS10 made recommendations (p. 7, paras. 2-5); See also IFI-RPRD, para. 6.
[205] JS10, para. 21. See also JS15, paras. 54-62.
[206] NCCP, para. 19.
[207] JS2, para. 51, referring to A/HRC/21/12, para. 129.11(Thailand). JS2 made a recommendation (para. 55).
[208] ERI, para. 19.
[209] ERI, para. 20. ERI made recommendations (para. 24 (h) and (i).
[210] JS18, p. 4. See also CRCN-P, para. 17. CRCN-P made recommendations (para. 29).
[211] JS16, p. 1.
[212] JS16, p. 1.
[213] JS20, para. 17.
[214] JS20, para. 18. JS20 made recommendations (para. 42).
[215] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/21/12, para. 130.7.
[216] JS9, p. 7.

[217] PCPR, paras. 28 and 29. PCPR made a recommendation para 30 (2). See also JS8, para. 47.1 and 47.3. See also Karapatan, para. 28; KMP, para. 3.

[218] JS16, p. 1. JS16 made recommendations (pp. 2 and 8).